

MEETING OF THE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

THURSDAY, November 17TH, 2005

Present: Jean Bonander
Alan Zahradnik
Andy Preston
Hamid Shamsapour
Rocky Birdsey
Amy Van Doren
Luke McCann
Karen Nygren
Mervin Giacomini
Mike DiGiorgio
Linda Jackson (Alternate for Bob Brown)

Absent: Fahrad Mansourian
Jay Tashiro

Staff Members Present: Craig Tackabery, TAM Deputy Director
Hank Haugse, Nolte Associates
David Parisi, Parisi Associates

Chair Bonander called the Technical Advisory Committee Meeting to order at 3:40 p.m.

1. Introductions

Committee members and staff did self-introductions.

2. Staff Comments

None

3. Committee Member Comments

Mervin Giacomini requested that time for public input be allowed during each item.

Chris Lang (alternate for Mervin Giacomini) requested that the new TAC members be sworn in.

4. Open Time for Public Expression

None

5. Consent Calendar

Meeting Minutes

M/S Zahradnik/Brown to approve the October 20, 2005 meeting minutes. The motion was approved unanimously.

Item 8. was taken out of order.

6. Brown Act Training Video

The Training Video was shown following item 8.

7. Measure A Strategy 3, Major Roads and Related Infrastructure

Item carried over until the December meeting.

8. Measure A Strategy 4 – Crossing Guard Program Process

TAM staff reviewed the Crossing Guard Program Development Process (agenda attachment) with the TAC. Based on the school survey undertaken in May and June 2005, existing crossing guard locations and locations that respondents considered crossing guards were needed were identified. TAM contracted with a traffic consultant to obtain “school pedestrian” counts and traffic counts at the existing and requested crossing guard locations. This data was collected during October and November 2005. Additional data will be collected during May 2006 for locations that were not identified in the 2005 survey.

Staff reviewed the schedule for the crossing guard program, with implementation planned for the 2006 / 2007 school year.

Staff provided the TAC with copies of the California MUTCD, *Part 7 Traffic Controls for School Areas* and a summary of *Criteria for Adult Crossing Guards*. This criterion is generally used by communities to determine if a crossing guard would be warranted and cost effective at a location. Craig Tackabery pointed out to the TAC that the criteria is not “binding,” but provides a starting point for discussion and prioritization.

Based on the Caltrans criteria and the preliminary data collected, the existing and requested locations that satisfied the criteria were identified.

Craig Tackabery pointed out that the Expenditure Plan stated that up to 70 locations would be funded under the Crossing Guard Program. In addition, the prioritization of the Crossing Guard locations would be developed in cooperation with the Public Works Directors from each city or town.

Karen Nygren asked about the liability issues of a volunteer crossing guard versus a professional crossing guard. Staff responded that the contractor providing the professional staff would have liability coverage.

Mike DiGiorgio asked what the cut-off point would be for the number of crossing guards. This would be useful to the TAC in application of the criteria. Rocky Birdsey asked how the funding would be applied to the existing crossing guard programs; would the schools or school district contribute funding or would the program only be funded by TAM? Craig Tackabery pointed out that the TAC's role is to prioritize the crossing guard locations,

and that the TAM Board would be responsible for program implementation and policy issues such as funding.

Linda Jackson pointed out that the Bahia Vista School in San Rafael was closed for this school year, but would re-open in 2006 / 2007 school year.

Hamid Shamsapour requested that the information be shared with the Public Works Directors. He felt that additional locations may warrant the use crossing guards because of special conditions, such as areas where vehicle speed is a factor. Rocky Birdsey stated that areas with high pedestrian counts, but low vehicle counts, may also require a crossing guard. In addition, accident data should be considered.

Jean Bonander suggested that Public Works Directors discuss the data with the local police departments. She pointed out that the data will change over time.

Luke McCann suggested that the data be shared with the school superintendents and that they could provide assistance to the TAC with the decision process.

Rocky Birdsey stated that the crossing guard program should coordinate with the Safe Route to School and the Safe Pathways to School programs. Jean Bonander also stressed the need for coordination of the three programs.

Staff agreed to provide information on policies that have been used to guide other programs. Jean Bonander stated that the TAC could provide policy recommendations to the TAM Board along with the prioritization of crossing guard locations.

The staff will also present information on the crossing guard data to the MPWA at their December meeting and at the next School Superintendents meeting.

Information from the MPWA and the School Superintendents would be provided to the TAC in January 2006.

The TAC requested copies of the maps illustrating the existing and requested crossing guard locations and of the tables identifying the existing and requested crossing guard street and city locations. The TAC also requested basic funding information for the Crossing Guard Program to be provided at the December meeting.

6. Brown Act Training Video

The Training Video was shown at this time.

7. Measure A Strategy 3, Major Roads and Related Infrastructure

Craig Tackabery recommended that the item be carried over until the December meeting. He informed the TAC that the MPWA was continuing to collect data for the performance criteria. This information as expected to be available for the next TAC meeting.

Karen Nygren requested an opportunity to present three points regarding the performance criteria. These are:

1. The performance criteria needs to reflect the overall goal of the Measure, as stated on page 3 of the Plan:

Improve mobility and reduce local congestion for everyone who lives or works in Marin County by providing a variety of high quality transportation options design to meet local needs.

2. The performance criteria for transit frequency needs to be clarified as to whether it includes all buses or just Golden Gate Transit buses.
3. The CHP report (SWTTRS) could be used as a source of accident information; however it is not always available. Should local data be used?

Jean Bonander stated that the policy statement could be added to the performance criteria and could be discussed in more detail at the next meeting.

Al Zahradnik stated that fixed schedule transit services can be monitored; however, others are difficult to track.

Chris Lang requested that the discussion on bike lanes address the situation where there is no bicycle facility but there are many bicycle users.

Andy Preston stated that he is concerned about the timing of the PCI as a performance criteria. Several of the city's roadways are in good shape now, but would be expected to deteriorate over the 20 year time frame of the Measure.

Chris Lang distributed an article regarding bicycle accidents.

9. Adjourn to December 15, 2005 meeting

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm